Government of Kerala
1982

Reg. No. KL/TV(N)/12

KERALA GAZETTE

EXTRAORDINARY

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Vol. XXVII] **Trivandrum, Thursday,** **14th January 1982 / 24th Pousha 1903** **[No. 34**

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Revenue (F) Department

NOTIFICATION

No. G. O. Rt. 39/82/RD. *Dated, Trivandrum, 14th January,* 1982.

S. R. O. No. 55/82.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 3 and 4 of the Guruvayoor Devaswom Act, 1978 (14 of 1978) and in supersession of the notification G. O. Rt. No. 1799/79/RD dated the 29th November, 1979, published as S. R. O. No. 1301/79 in the Kerala Gazette Extraordinary No. 854 dated the 29th November, 1979, the Government of Kerala hereby reconstitute with effect from 14th January, 1982, the Guruvayoor Devaswom Managing Gommittee consisting of the following members, namely:—

1. The Zamorin Raja
2. The Karanavan of the Mallisseri Illom at Guruvayoor
3. The Thanthri of the Temple, ex officio
4. Shri P. Ramakrishnan Nair, Paliathu House, Thycaud P.O., Guruvayoor — Representative of the employees of the Devaswom nominated by the Hindus among the Council of Ministers under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Act.

5. Shri K. Gopalan, Post Makkada, (via) Kakkodi, Kozhikode	Nominated by the Hindus among the Council of Ministers under clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Act.
6. Shri Kidangoor A. N. Gopala-krishna Pillai, General Secretary, Nair Service Society, Changanacherry-2.	
7. Shri P. T. Mohanakrishnan, P. O. Eramangalam, Ponnani Taluk	
8. Shri M. Krishnankutty, Advocate, P. O., Wadakkancherry, Trichur District	
9. Shri N. Sreenivasan, Saras, Jawahar Nagar, Trivandrum-3.	

By order of the Governor,

C. K. K. PANICKER,

Special Secretary to Government.

Explanatory Note

(This does not form part of the notification, but is intended to indicate its general purport).

The term of the members of the Guruvayoor Devaswom Managing Committee nominated under clause (d) and clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 4 expired on 29-11-1981. The notification is to nominate members to the above vacancies.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE S. G. P. AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS, TRIVANDRUM, 1982.

©
Government of Kerala
1982

Reg. No. KL/TV(N)/12

KERALA GAZETTE

EXTRAORDINARY

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Vol. XXVII] Trivandrum, Thursday, 14th January 1982 / 24th Pousha 1903 [No. 35

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Transport, Fisheries and Ports (Transport B) Department

NOTIFICATION

No. 14638|TB3|80|TF&P *Dated, Trivandrum, 14th January,* 1982.

Whereas a reciprocal agreement had already been entered into between the States of Karnataka and Kerala in respect of inter-State routes as per Notification No. 10845|TB3|74|PW dated the 26th June, 1976 published as S. R. O. No. 698|76 in the Kerala Gazette Extraordinary No. 392 dated the 30th June, 1976;

And whereas, the Governments of Karnataka and Kerala have agreed to enter into a supplementary agreement under section 63 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, (Central Act IV of 1939), for the enhancement of quota of public carrier goods vehicles, private carrier goods vehicles, Tourist Taxis and Motor cabs for operation on inter-State routes by operators of both the States on single point tax basis;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3A) of section 63 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, (Central Act IV of 1939), and in supplementation to the provisions of the said reciprocal agreement the Government of Kerala hereby publish the following draft supplementary inter-State agreement to be

entered into between the Government of Kerala and the Government of Karnataka;

Notice is hereby given that the said draft agreement will be taken up for consideration on or after 15-2-1982 and that any objection or suggestion that may be received from any person with respect to the said draft agreement before the date aforesaid will be considered by the Government of Kerala.

Objections and suggestions, if any, in duplicate shall be addressed to the Special Secretary to the Government of Kerala, Transport, Fisheries and Ports (Transport B) Department, Government Secretariat, Trivandrum.

By order of the Governor,

P. SANKARAN NAIR,

Additional Secretary to Government.

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY INTER-STATE AGREEMENT NO. I

This agreement is made this day of One thousand Nine hundred and Eighty-two (1982) between the Governor of Karnataka (hereinafter called the Government of Karnataka, which expression shall, where the context so admits, include his successors in office) on the one part and the Governor of Kerala (hereinafter called the Government of Kerala which expression shall, where the context so admits, include her successors in office) on the other part;

Subject to the other conditions of the existing agreement:

(1) (a) the total number of permits (other than temporary permits issued under section 62 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939) for public carrier goods vehicles for operation on inter-State routes between Karnataka and Kerala on single point tax shall be fixed as 2000, the number of such permits issued in each State shall not exceed 1000;

(b) the total number of permits (other than temporary permits issued under section 62 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939) for private carrier goods vehicles for operation on inter-State routes between Karnataka and Kerala on single point tax shall be fixed as 200, the number of such permits issued in each State shall not exceed 100;

(c) the total number of permits for Tourist Taxis for operation on inter-State routes between Karnataka and Kerala on single point tax shall be fixed as 200, the number of such permits issued in each State shall not exceed 100;

(d) the total number of permits for Motor cabs for operation on inter-State routes between Karnataka and Kerala on single point tax shall be fixed as 300, the number of such permits issued in each State shall not exceed 150.

(2) The quota of such permits for public carriers, private carriers, Tourist Taxis and Motor Cabs of each State to be countersigned by the other State in accordance with the proviso to sub-section 3 of section 63 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, shall be 1000, 100, 100 and 150, respectively, the position being reviewed when the number of permits in any State reaches 975 in the case of public carrier goods vehicles, 95 in the case of private carrier goods vehicles, 95 in the case of Tourist Taxis and 140 in the case of Motor cabs.

Explanatory Note

(This is not part of the notification, but is intended to bring out its main purport).

As per the existing inter-State agreement between the Governments of Kerala and Karnataka the quota of public carrier permits, private carrier permits, Tourist Taxis permits and Motor cab permits for inter-State operation between the two states on single point tax basis had been fixed as 600, 50, 50 and 75 respectively. As all these available vacancies have been fully utilised by both the State Governments and as there is pressing demand for operation of more number of such vehicles both State Governments have agreed to enter into a supplementary inter-State agreement enhancing the quota of public carrier permits from 600 to 1000, private carrier permits from 50 to 100, Tourist Taxi permits from 50 to 100 and Motor cab permits from 75 to 150. This notification is intended to achieve the above purpose.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE S. G. P. AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS,
TRIVANDRUM, 1982.

Kerala Gazette No. 3 dated 14th January 1982
PART I

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Labour (A) Department

NOTIFICATION

G. O. (Rt.) No. 1475/81/LBR. *Dated, Trivandrum, 30th November 1981.*

The award of the Labour Court, Ernakulam in respect of the dispute between the Manager, Letchmi Estate, Tata-Finlay Ltd., Munnar and the workmen of the above Estate represented by the Secretary, Deviculam Estate Worker's Union, Munnar received by Government on 27-11-1981 is hereby published under section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order of the Governor,
P. Gomathy Amma,
Deputy Secretary.

In the Labour Court, Ernakulam

Dated this the 23rd day of November 1981

Present

Shri N. SUKUMARAN, B. Sc., B. L.,

Presiding Officer

In

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 13 OF 1979

Between

The Manager, Letchmi Estate, Tata-Finlay Ltd., Munnar.

And

The workmen of the above Estate represented by the Secretary, Deviculam Estate Worker's Union, Munnar.

Representations :—

Shri K. V. R. Shenoi,
Advocate,
M/s Menon & Pai,
Advocates, Ernakulam : For *Management*

Shri K. Damodara Kurup,
Advocate,
Associated Law Chamber,
Cochin-11. : For *Union.*

G A. 284/V

AWARD

Dismissal of four workmen is the issue referred for adjudication by Government as per G. O. (Rt.) No. 271/79/L & H dated 24-2-1979. They were dismissed after a domestic enquiry. I found as per my order dated 24-6-1980 that there was no proper domestic enquiry in so far as the findings, of the Enquiry Officer were perverse. That order contains the necessary facts. So it is extracted hereunder in full:—

"ORDER

Sarvasree Swaminathan, Varghese, Paramasivan and Savarimuthu were dismissed by the Manager, Letchmi Estate, Munnar. The dismissal was after a domestic enquiry. It was conducted by MW1, an Advocate of Ernakulam. Ext. M1 is the file containing the enquiry papers. MW1 found in Ext. M2 report that the four workmen are guilty of the misconduct alleged. The validity of the domestic enquiry is challenged by the Union and therefore that issue was tried first. This order relates to that aspect alone.

2. The charge admittedly served on the workmen is the following:—

"Riotous or disorderly behaviour on the premises of the Estate, or any act subversive to discipline in that it is alleged that on 31st July 1976 at around 12 noon each one of you individually and collectively waylaid, assaulted and caused grievous injury to Sri M. A. Kurian Conductor of Middle Division of this Estate. A copy of Sri Kurian's report in this connection has already been furnished to you."

The workmen pleaded not guilty and took up a further contention that the incident as alleged took place beyond the premises of the Estate and it has nothing to do with their employment and therefore it cannot be treated as a misconduct falling under the particular clause of the Standing Orders referred in the charge. They had a further case that Swaminathan and Paramasivan and two others alone were arrayed as accused in a parellel criminal prosecution initiated by the Police on a complaint preferred by Conductor Shri Kurian who is alleged to have been assaulted and therefore in any event Varghese and Savarimuthu should not have been included in the disciplinary proceedings.

3. Yet another contention is that Varghese and Paramasivan, who are respectively the President and Secretary of the Estate Sub-Committee of the D. E. W. Union, have been implicated on account of their active union work with a view to victimise them. As regards the enquiry it is said in the rejoinder filed that it was not in accordance with the principles of natural justice.

4. More serious attacks are raised in the pleadings advanced by the Union regarding the merits of the case and the attack against the domestic enquiry are only general. What is stated is that the enquiry was not impartial. But it is seen that an independent Advocate was appointed to conduct the enquiry. Ext. M1 enquiry file shows that the workmen participated in the enquiry throughout. They were given all facilities by

MW1 to cross-examine the six witnesses examined on the side of the management. Some of the witnesses were cross-examined by some of the workmen involved and stated that they have no cross-examination of the other witnesses. The depositions are all signed by the aggreived workmen. MW2, a Clerk of the Management, was appointed as the interpreter at the enquiry to translate the depositions given in English to Tamil. MW2 has given evidence that he had truly and correctly translated the depositions. The workmen were given a chance to adduce their evidence. Then they produced three documents and they were also marked at the enquiry in evidence. The workmen said that they have no oral evidence. apart from individual statements that they proposed to make. The statements so made by them were also recorded by the Enquiry Officer. So it is evident that the Enquiry Officer gave all facilities to the workmen to defend themselves. The workmen had sought a chance to have the assistance of co-workers as observers. They told the Enquiry Officer that they are not availing of that opportunity. Hence it is clear that the Management or the Enquiry Officer did not violate any of the principles of natural justice.

5. Victimisation is another plea. Union activity is stated to be the motive for victimisation. Two of the workers as mentioned already are said to be the Secretary and the President of the Estates Sub-Committee of the D. E. W. Union. That is a Union which is functioning in all the estates belonging to the Company which owns the Letchmi Estate. No special reasons are suggested as to why these two workmen were singled out for action on account of Union activities. This is not a case where the Management initiated proceedings without any reasonable basis. We have sufficient evidence to which I shall refer later from which it can be said that Conductor Shri Kurian was brutally attacked and Shri Kurian in his report stated that these workmen were responsible for the assault. The action was initiated in that manner. So it cannot be said that the disciplinary proceedings were initiated with a motive to victimise the workers who are Union Officials. So the allegation of victimisation is also not established. For the same reasons want of good faith or unfair labour practice cannot be inferred.

6. The serious contention of the Union is that there is no acceptable evidence at the enquiry to come to the conclusion that these workmen were the assailants responsible for the assault of Shri Kurian. That Shri Kurian was brutally attacked in a lonely place at a sharp corner on the estate road leading from the Sevenmallay Estate to Munnar at about noon on 31-7-1976 is amply proved in the case. Hereafter I shall refer the witnesses and documents as they were arrayed and marked at the enquiry. Shri Kurian as MW1 has given evidence that he was attacked from behind at the scene of occurrence by six people while he (Kurian) was riding in a bicycle to Munnar. He abandoned the cycle and attempted to escape. But the assailants dealt severe blows with leathal weapons like stick and iron rods on various parts of his body resulting in several fractures some of them compound. He raised a cry of alarm following which the assailants took to their heels and escaped. Then MW3

Shri Madaswamy came that way. He told Shri Madaswamy as to what had happened and the names of the persons who attacked him. He was later removed to the hospital by MW4 Asst. Conductor to whom information regarding the attack was conveyed by MW3 through some other person. There he was treated by MW2, the Medical Officer. MW2 has given evidence in detail regarding the various injuries that had been sustained by Shri Kurian. Most of the injuries were serious and they involved several fractures also. The workmen do not challenge the evidence of these witnesses on this aspect of the case. In other words the Management's case that Shri Kurian sustained injuries at the hands of some assailants at the time and place alleged is admitted and proved.

7. The crucial question is as to who were the assailants. According to MW1 six persons including the four workmen with whom we are concerned attacked him. The two others are alleged to be strangers as far as the Estate is concerned. Individual overtacts of attack are attributed to the four workmen. As already mentioned the incident took place at a lonely place and evidence of independent eye witnesses cannot normally be insisted. The Management relies on the testimony of MW3, who was the first to see MWI with injuries soon after the incident. MW1 claims to have given the names of the assailants to MW3. But MW3 when examined stated in chief examination itself that he does not remember all the six names mentioned to him by MW1 and that he could give only four names. The four names narrated by him are Sarvasree Swaminathan, Sasidharan, Panieer and Varghese. Sasidharan and Panieer are not the workers of the Estate. So the names of only two of the four workmen involved here, viz., Swaminathan and Varghese alone were given by MW3 before the Enquiry Officer. So there is no corroboration of the names of Paramasivan and Savarimuthu in the testimony of MW 3. It is the admitted case that there was a parallel criminal prosecution initiated by the Police on a statement given by MW1 from the hospital. That case was tried as C. C. 282 of 1976 before the First Class Megistrate Devicolam. It is admitted that the accused in the case were Sarvasree Paramasivan, Swamynathan, Sasidharan and Paineer. The names of Varghese and Savarimuthu were not mentioned by MW1 before Police when he gave a complaint there. It is vehemently argued on behalf of the Management that MW1 who had sustained the serious injuries must have been under a grave shock when he narrated the names to MW 3 and gave information to the Police and the discrepancies, if any, in his statement regarding the names are to be ignored. It may be true that MW1 who has sustained serious injuries in that state of mind and body could only have faint memories of the names of his assailants. But in the peculiar circumstances of this case we have to depend on the memory of MW1 to pin down the guilt on the accused. If MW1 had given any mistaken names then it is highly unsafe to act on it. In the absence of special reasons to disbelieve MW1 even his uncorroborated evidence could have been accepted. But when he himself had given different names at different stages immediately after the incident it is highly unsafe to depend on his

testimony alone to fasten the liability on the accused workman. No doubt the Management had produced evidence at the stage of enquiry to show that these four workmen were absent without leave or permission from the estate. But that solitary circumstance cannot be a safe guide to say that these four workers alone could have been the assailants as it is not proved that these workers alone were the absentees at the relevant time. It is also pertinent to note that it is the admitted case that persons who were not the workers on the estate also have participated in the attack. So the circumstance that these workers were absent without leave cannot help the Management's case in any way. So also the failure of the workmen to give satisfactory proof in support of their alibi is of no consequence at all.

8. Another circumstance claimed by the management is that these workmen had a special grudge against Shri Kurian. The allegation is that they had earlier raised some complaints against Shri Kurian. The fact that the complaints were raised is a circumstance for Kurian also to have entertained an ill-will towards the complainants. So the motive in the circumstances is double edged and can cut both ways. So the motive also cannot come to the aid of the Management to fix the liability on these workmen. From what has been stated above it follows that the evidence available is far from convincing to come to the conclusion that these four workmen caused hurt to Shri Kurian. So the finding of the Enquiry Officer has to be termed as perverse as it is not supported by convincing evidence. The enquiry though it did not offend the principles of natural justice is vitiated for the reason that the finding is perverse. Hence I find that the enquiry is not proper. The Management no doubt will be at liberty to adduce evidence afresh before this court if so advised. That being the position I do not propose to comment at this stage on the contention that the acts attributed to the workmen even if proved will not amount to a misconduct as per the particular provision of the Standing Orders. In the result it is hereby ordered that the finding of the Enquiry Officer cannot be accepted and the enquiry therefore is not valid."

II. After the above order the Management opted to adduce fresh evidence before this Court. Four witnesses were also examined by the Management. The Union also adduced oral evidence. They have examined five witnesses. The evidence on either side was thus closed and the case was coming up for arguments at which stage the parties settled the dispute between themselves and filed the following memorandum of settlement:-

"(i) The above dispute is regarding the dismissal of four dismissed workers. The Management agrees to reinstate on or before the 1st December 1981, three of them namely (1) Varghese 1478, (2) Paramasivan No. 1760 and (3) Savarimuthu No. 1904, with continuity of service but without back wages.

of work in the establishment. In all probability, the workman might have used the address of the management in view of his connection with the management in that capacity. The address given in Ext. X2 can be regarded only as a self serving statement which cannot be held as binding on the management in any way. In this connection it has to be taken into account that the name of the workman is not found entered in Ext. M2, the register of employment for the year 1976-77, I will have occasion to consider Ext. M2 in greater detail hereafter. Ext. XI is the Inspection Note of the Assistant Labour Officer, Calicut-1, he appears to have inspected the establishment of the management on 22-2-1977. The case of the workman in the claim statement is that the Assistant Labour Officer inspected the establishment the same day as the employees placed the charter of demands by a strange co-incidence. According to the workman the charter of demands was placed in January, 1977 and he was denied employment on 14-2-1977. The case of the workman does not tally with Ext. XI. In column 5 of Ext. XI number of persons employed is shown as six whereas on the back of it it is shown as 8. 4 persons are stated as entered in the register of employment whereas 4 persons are stated as to be entered in the same. WW1 is the Assistant Labour Officer. He stated in his cross-examination that the name of only one employee was entered in the Muster Roll and that there were two other employees of whom one is the partner and the other is the employee who had left the establishment. He would say that he entered the names of the employee found working on that day in Ext. XI. He further admitted that as per Ext. XI it can be seen that the names of 4 persons were entered in the Muster Roll. He admitted that he did not state in his inspection note in Ext. M2 that only the name of one employee is entered in the same. The inspection note is that the names of all workers working in the establishment is not entered in the register and the inspection was on 22-2-1977. Ext. M2 shows that there was another inspection on 19-1-1977 and the direction was that the Muster Roll should be maintained in form No. 28. There is no remarks that the name of any employee is omitted to be entered on that date which shows that there were only 4 employees. Ext. M2 further shows that the same was inspected by Additional Inspector of Factories on 9-6-1976 and the direction was to enter the name of one T. N. Murali in the Muster Roll and the same is seen as entered. WW1 admitted that he had visited the establishment prior to Ext. XI. Ext. M2 does not show the name of the workman as an employee. The inspection notes of the Factory Inspector and the Assistant Labour Officer do not show that the workman in this was employed under the management. The inspection note of the Factory Inspector shows a direction to include the name of one Murali. Even so, there is no direction to include the name of the workman in the employment register. If the workman was really working under the establishment as stated by him then I do not see why a direction to that effect was not found in the inspection note of the Factory Inspector. The inspection note of Assistant Labour Officer on 19-1-1977 also does not show a direction that the workman in this was employed under the establishment and to include his name. Even the inspection note dated 22-2-1977 does not contain the name of the

workman as having worked under the management. The workman relies on the inspection note stating that the names of all employees not entered. The same will not show that the workman was an employee under the management. It has not been brought out through WW1 that when he visited the establishment on previous occasions he had found the workman working in the establishment. Therefore, the inspection note dated 22-2-1977 will not by itself establish the relationship of employer and employee as contended by the workman. The names of the workmen to be entered is stated in Ext. X1. The same is seen as entered in Ext. M2. It does not show the name of the workman therefore the two documents relied on the workman to establish the relationship cannot be held as showing the same. Apart from the above there is only the interested testimony of WW3 the workman himself. The suggestion put to WW3 and denied by him is that he was working in some other establishments during the time he is alleged as working under the management. But the evidence of MW4 shows that the workman and that witness were working together for about 4½ years till about 7 years back, (he was examined on 30-4-1981) in the St. Thomas Press at Vellimadukunnu. There is no suggestion that MW4 has any axe to grind against the workman. The suggestion is that the management used to give him some work which he denied. Under the circumstances, MW4 has to be regarded as an independent witness and his evidence shows that the workman could not have been working under the management during the relevant period. MW2 is a workman under the management and his evidence shows that the workman was not working under the management. The case is that he is giving evidence to oblige the management; but nothing has been brought out to show that he has any enmity towards the workman. MW1 the managing partner had denied the employment of the workman. The same coupled with the evidence of MW2 and MW4 and Ext. M2 show, that the workman was not employed as stated by him under the management. The contention that the management was not maintaining the register of employment and other records cannot be regarded as correct in view of Ext. M2, inspected by the Factory Inspector and the Assistant Labour Officer. The case of the management that it came into existence only in 1975 also cannot be given much weight because what happened in 1975 as could be seen from Ext. M1 is the conversion of the proprietory concern by name "Vijaya Book Depot" into a partnership concern by name "Vijaya Book Depot and Printers" the evidence of MW1 shows that the Vijaya Book Depot was in existence from 1962 onwards. In view of what is stated earlier, it cannot be held that the workman establish that he was an employee employed by the management. As such his case of denial of employment cannot be regarded as true and correct. Hence I hold that there was no denial of employment as the workman was not an employee. The issue is found accordingly.

8. In view of my above findings, I pass the award holding that there was no denial of employment as the workman was not an employee and therefore he is not entitled to any reliefs.

GA, 249/B.

9. This award will come into force 30 days after the date of publication in the Official Gazette.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed by him, revised, corrected and passed by me on 1st day of September 1981.

T. M. Vishnu Nambissan,
Presiding Officer
Labour Court, Kozhikode.

Appendix

Witnesses examined on the side of the management.—

MW1—Sri T. Govindan.

MW2—Sri Sekharan.

MW3—Sri Nayadi.

MW4—Sri Inashu.

Documents marked on the side of the management.—

Ext. M1—Partnership deed dated 1-4-1975.

Ext. M2—Register of employment.

Witnesses examined on the side of the workman.—

WW1—Sri E. P. Sivadasan.

WW2—Sri K. K. Jayaram

WW3—Sri N. Thayyutty.

Documents marked on the side of the Workman.—

Ext. X1—Inspection Note of Assistant Labour Officer, Kozhikode (North).

Ext. X2—Nithya Nithi Deposit Account of Canara Bank.

©
Government of Kerala
1982

Reg. No. KL/TV(N)/12

216953

KERALA GAZETTE

EXTRAORDINARY

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Vol. XXVII] Trivandrum, Thursday, 14th January 1982 / 24th pousha 1903 (Saka) [No. 36

NOTICE

UNDER SECTION 9(5) OF THE KERALA LAND ACQUISITION ACT, 1961 (ACT 21 OF 1962)

No. LA2-1070/80/B/18. *14th January 1982.*

Notice is hereby given that the Government intend to take possession of the lands mentioned in the list below, which are required for a public purpose under the Kerala Land Acquisition Act, 1961 (Act 21 of 1962). All persons interested in the lands are required to appear in person or by authorised agent on the date, time and place noted below and to state/put in a statement in writing signed by themselves or their agents showing the nature of their respective interests in the lands and the amount and particulars of their claim to compensation for such interests in the lands and their objections, if any to the measurements made under section 8 of the Act.

Note :—If the persons interested refuse to make a claim to compensation or omit without sufficient reasons, to make such claim, the amount to be awarded by the Court, in the event of a reference being made to it on application made by them shall in no case exceed the amount awarded by the Collector under section 11 of the Act.

താഴെ കൊടുത്തിരിക്കുന്ന ലിസ്ററിൽ പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതും 1961-ലെ കേരള സ്ഥലമെടുപ്പ് ആക്ററ്(1962-ലെ 21-ാം ആക്ററ്) പ്രകാരം ഒരുപൊതുക്കാര്യത്തിന് ആവശ്യമായിട്ടുള്ളതുമായ ഭൂമി കൈവശപ്പെടുത്തുവാൻ ഗവൺമെൻറുദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നുവെന്ന് ഇതിനാൽ നോട്ടീസ് നൽകിയിരിക്കുന്നു. പ്രസ്തുത ഭൂമിയിൽ അവകാശബന്ധമുള്ള എല്ലാപേരും നേരിട്ടോ, അധികൃത ഏജൻറുമൂലമോ താഴെ പറയുന്ന തീയതിയിലും സമയത്തും സ്ഥലത്തും

ഹാജരാകുകയും, ഭൂമിയിൽ അവരോരോരുത്തർക്കുമുള്ള അവകാശബന്ധങ്ങളുടെ സ്വഭാവവും, ഭൂമിയിൽ അങ്ങനെയുള്ള അവകാശബന്ധങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം നഷ്ടപ്രതിഫലത്തിന് അവർക്കുള്ള തേർച്ചയുടെ തുകയും വിവരങ്ങളും ആക്റ്റ് 8-ാം വകുപ്പുപ്രകാരം എടുത്തിട്ടുള്ള അളവു സംബന്ധിച്ച് വല്ല ആക്ഷേപവുമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതും ഏതാണെന്നു കാണിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് പ്രസ്താവന ചെയ്യുകയും, അവരോ അവരുടെ ഏജന്റുമാരോ എഴുതി ഒപ്പിട്ട ഒരു സ്റ്റേറ്റുമെന്റ് സമർപ്പിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യണമെന്ന് അവരോട് ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നു.

കുറിപ്പ്:—അവകാശബന്ധമുള്ളവർ നഷ്ടപ്രതിഫലത്തിന് തേർച്ച ചെയ്യാൻ കൂട്ടാക്കാതിരിക്കുകയോ, മതിയായ കാരണമില്ലാതെ അങ്ങനെ തേർച്ചചെയ്യാൻ വീഴ്ചചെയ്യുകയോ ചെയ്യുന്നപക്ഷം അവരുടെ അപേക്ഷയിൻമേൽ കോടതിക്ക് റഫറൻസ് അയയ്ക്കുന്ന സംഗതിയിൽ കോടതി വിധിച്ചുകൊടുക്കേണ്ട തുക യാതൊരു സംഗതിയിലും ആക്റ്റ് 11-ാം വകുപ്പുപ്രകാരം കളക്ടർ വിധിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുന്ന തുകയിൽ കവിയാൻ പാടില്ലാത്തതാകുന്നു.

Date, time and place of appearance—On 27-1-1982 at 11 a. m. before the Special Tahsildar, L. A. (N.H.), Kazhakkuttom.

PARTICULARS OF LANDS

District—Trivandrum.

Taluk—Trivandrum. Village—Attipra.

Sl. No.	*Survey No.*	*Description*	*Extent Ares*	*Sq. m*
1	2285/3	Dry land	05	05
2	949/13	„	03	45
3	949/7	„	02	64
4	949/6	„	02	64
5	949/3	„	02	61
6	949/2	„	03	50
7	933/2	„	05	87
8	932/1	„	07	69
9	932/3	„	04	10
10	934/2	„	05	87
11	934/4	„	06	32
12	2279/B3	„	05	17
13	950/6	„	07	38

(Sd.)
Special Tahsildar,
L. A. N. H.

Kazhakkuttom.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE S. G. P. AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS,
TRIVANDRUM, 1982.